



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,028	09/28/2001	Maurice Granger	1759.053	4669

7590 01/30/2003

John Pietrangleo
Heslin Rothenberg Farley & Mesiti P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No. 09/966,028	Applicant(s) Granger
Examiner Clark F. Dexter	Art Unit 3724

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. John Pietrangelo

(3) _____

(2) Mr. Clark Dexter

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jan 28, 2003Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Fleischauer, pn 3,961,700; Granger, pn 4,846,035Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Pietrangelo called to discuss issues raised in the last Office action (paper no. 9). Regarding the abstract, the Examiner's only concern is that the word "means" be removed from the abstract. Regarding the specification, the Examiner stated that the phrase "means of transmission" is awkward and suggested replacing it with "means for transmission" or "transmission means" or the like. Regarding the rejections under 35 USC 112, the Examiner further explained his position and suggested adopting the language proposed in the middle of page 8 of the last Office action or similar language. Regarding the prior art rejections, the Examiner further explained his position and emphasized that an intended use of the device could not be relied upon to distinguish a claimed invention over the prior art and suggested that applicant add structure or structural relationships to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

CLARK F. DEXTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3724

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.